

APPENDIX AAttorneys' Fee Calculations

Bingham - \$690,367.00 requested in fees

The following billed hours and sums are subtracted from the sum \$ 690,367.00.

1. Elimination of Hours of Non-Legal Personnel.

<u>December 2006</u>	Hours	Rate		
Dippery	1.3	@ 175.00	=	227.50
Wardell	9	@ 200.00	=	1800.00
<u>January 2007</u>				
Dippery	8.9	@ 190.00	=	1691.00
Wardell	0.5	@ 210.00	=	105.00
<u>March 2007</u>				
Wardell	4.0	@ 210.00	=	840.00
<u>April 2007</u>				
deVore	6.2	@ 85.00	=	527.00
Wardell	25.0	@ 210.00	=	5250.00
<u>May 2007</u>				
Wardell	29.5	@ 210.00	=	6195.00
<u>June 2007</u>				
Wardell	0.5	@ 210.00	=	105.00
<u>July 2007</u>				
Wardell	0.7	@ 210.00	=	147.00
<u>August 2007</u>				
Wardell	0.4	@ 210.00	=	84.00
				<u>TOTAL:</u> \$16,971.50

That sum is subtracted from the total sum billed by Bingham timekeepers.

\$ 690,367.00
<u>- 16,971.50</u>
673,395.50

2. Reduction to Better Reflect Rates Charged in Baltimore Legal Market.

The reduced sum of \$673,395.50 is reduced by 10%, representing a 10% reduction of billable rates, to better reflect standard rates charged by attorneys and paralegals in the Baltimore legal market.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 673,395.50 \times .10 = 67,339.55 \\ - \quad 67,339.55 \\ \hline 606,055.95 \end{array}$$

3. Reduction to Address Block-Billing and Documentation Deficiencies.

The adjusted sum of \$606,055.95 is further reduced by 10% to compensate for the billing deficiencies discussed in the Court's opinion.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 606,055.95 \times .10 = 60,605.60 \\ - \quad 60,605.60 \\ \hline 545,450.35 \end{array}$$

The sum of \$545,450.35 is added to the \$68,801.52 in Bingham expenses.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 545,450.35 \\ + \quad 68,801.52 \\ \hline 614,251.87 \end{array}$$

TOTAL

Andrews - \$223,615.80 requested in fees.

1. Reduction to Better Reflect Rates Charged in Baltimore Legal Community.

The \$223,615.80 is reduced by 10%, representing a 10% reduction of billable rates, to better reflect standard rates charged by attorneys and paralegals in the Baltimore legal market.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 223,615.80 \times .10 = 22,361.58 \\ - \quad 22,361.58 \\ \hline 201,254.22 \end{array}$$

2. Reduction to Address Block-Billing and Documentation Deficiencies.

The reduced sum of \$201,254.22 is further reduced by 10% to compensate for the billing deficiencies discussed in the Court's

opinion.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 201,254.22 \times .10 = 20,125.42 \\ - \quad 20,125.42 \\ \hline 181,128.80 \end{array}$$

The sum of \$181,128.80 is added to the \$15,278.50 in Andrews' expenses.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 181,128.80 \\ + \quad 15,278.50 \\ \hline \text{TOTAL} \quad 196,407.30 \end{array}$$

The Bingham and Andrews sums are added together.

$$\begin{array}{r} \$ 614,251.87 \\ + \quad 196,407.30 \\ \hline \text{GRAND TOTAL} \quad 810,659.17 \\ \text{OF FEES AND COSTS} \end{array}$$